REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 14-17, 22 and 28-32 are amended. No new claims are added. Claims 6-7 and 18 are cancelled without prejudice. Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue the cancelled claims in one or more continuation or divisional applications. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least at page 4, line 2 to page 15, line 7 of the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced through the amendments to the claims.

Claims 1-5, 8-17 and 19-32 are pending for consideration. In view of the following amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

§ 101 Rejections

Claims 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for, in the opinion of the Office, being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that independent claim 22 is directed to "software" and "fails to fall into one of the 4 categories of invention." (Page 2 of Office action). Applicant asserts that Examiner has founded the foregoing § 101 rejection on improper grounds.

However, in the interest of clarity and expeditious prosecution, independent claim 22 has been amended to recite "a system implemented at least in part by a computing device, comprising:" Applicant believes that claim 22, as amended, recites subject matter well within statutory boundaries and requests that the § 101 rejection be withdrawn. Applicant further asserts that the § 101 rejections against claims 23-27, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 22, have been addressed by virtue of the amendment to claim 22. Applicant respectfully requests that such § 101 rejections be withdrawn.

As to independent claim 28, the Examiner has asserted that communication media includes "data in a modulated signal, such as a carrier wave or other transport mechanism." (Page 2 of Office action). Claim 28 has been amended as indicated above to recite "one or more tangible computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:". Applicant believes that claim 28, as amended, is well within the bounds of statutory subject matter and requests that the § 101 rejection be withdrawn. Applicant asserts that claims 29-32 have been amended as indicated above and that the § 101 rejections there against have been fully addressed. Applicant requests that the § 101 rejections against claims 29-32 be withdrawn.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0204632 ("Willebeek-LeMair").

The Claims

Claim 1 has been amended and, as amended, recites a method comprising:

- receiving an event from a first security engine;
- identifying a second security engine configured to utilize information contained in the event; and
- communicating the information contained in the event to the second security engine, wherein the event corresponds to identifying a password that does not comply with predetermined criteria.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection.

Specifically, Willebeek-LeMair fails to provide <u>receiving an event from a</u>

first security engine, wherein the event corresponds to identifying a password that does not comply with predetermined criteria, as recited by the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Rather, Willebeek-LeMair is directed to various functionalities integrated together to form a network security system (Abstract of Willebeek-LeMair). Generally, Willebeek-LeMair describes different computer security threats and vulnerabilities, and means that are used to protect against them. None the less, Willebeek-LeMair is completely lacking: 1) any mention of a "password"; 2) any equivalent of the word "password"; or 3) any sort of operation pertaining to a "password". In short, Willebeek-LeMair is totally devoid of identifying a password that does not comply with predetermined criteria.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant asserts that the § 102 rejection against claim 1, as amended, is unsupportable and must be withdrawn. Applicant further asserts that claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 8-13, as respectively amended, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as a well as for the patentable subject matter that each recites.

Claim 14 has been amended and, as amended, recites a method comprising:

- receiving a security-related event from a first security-related application program, the security-related event being associated with a system state;
- identifying information contained in the security-related event;
- identifying a second security-related application program associated with the information contained in the security-related event; and
- communicating the information contained in the security-related event to the second security-related application program.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection.

Specifically, Willebeek-LeMair fails to provide <u>receiving a security-related</u> <u>event from a first security-related application program, the security-related event</u> <u>being associated with a system state</u>, as recited by the subject matter of claim 14, as amended. In fact, Willebeek-LeMair is devoid of any mention of a "system state".

In view of the foregoing, Applicant asserts that claim 14, as amended, is not anticipated by Willebeek-LeMair. Applicant further asserts that claim 14, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 15-17 and 19-21, as respectively amended, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as a well as for the patentable subject matter that each recites.

Claim 22 has been amended and, as amended, recites a system implemented at least in part by a computing device, comprising:

- a first security engine associated with a first type of security attack, the first security engine including configuration to detect a password that does not comply with predetermined criteria;
- a second security engine associated with a second type of security attack; and
- an event manager coupled to receive events from the first security engine and the second security engine, the event manager further to identify information contained in the events and to identify at least one security engine associated with information contained in a particular event, and further to communicate the information contained in the particular event to the at least one security engine.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection.

Specifically, Willebeek-LeMair fails to provide <u>a first security engine</u>

associated with a first type of security attack, the first security engine including configuration to detect a password that does not comply with predetermined criteria, as recited by the subject matter of claim 22, as amended.

For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as for reasons analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1, Applicant asserts that the § 102 rejection against claim 22, as amended, is unsupportable and should be withdrawn. Applicant further asserts that claim 22, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 23-27 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as a well as for the patentable subject matter that each recites.

Claim 28 has been amended and, as amended, recites one or more tangible computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

- receive a first security-related event from a first service, the first security-related event corresponding to a network-related aspect of a system state;
- identify information contained in the first security-related event;
- receive a second security-related event from a second service;
- identify information contained in the second security-related event;
- communicate information contained in the first security-related event to the second service; and
- communicate information contained in the second security-related event to the first service.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection.

Specifically, Willebeek-LeMair fails to receive a first security-related event from a first service, the first security-related event corresponding to a network-

related aspect of a system state, as recited by the subject matter of claim 28, as amended.

For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as for reasons analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 14, Applicant asserts that the § 102 rejection against claim 28, as amended, is unsupportable and should be withdrawn. Applicant further asserts that claim 28, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 29-32, as respectively amended, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as a well as for the patentable subject matter that each recites.

Conclusion

The claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb – 23 – 2007   By: _Scott K. Gallert_

Scott K. Gallert
Reg. No. 51,715
(509) 324-9256 x.266